

**POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
FOR THE
2020 PENINSULA STUDY**

**March 5, 2003
MEETING NOTES**

The meeting of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) for the 2020 Peninsula Study was held at Menlo Park City Hall. The meeting began at 4:00 p.m.

Attending the meeting were: Mark Duino (C/CAG Staff), Rich Haygood (Redwood City), Dennis Struecker and Brent Ogden (Korve Engineering), James Janz (Atherton Council), Carolyn Gonot and Joanne Benjamin (Valley Transportation Authority), Duane Bay (East Palo Alto Council), Mickie Winkler (Menlo Park Council), Nick Galiotto (Mountain View Council), Larry Hassett (Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District), Sue Lempert (City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, Metropolitan Transportation Commissioner), David Boesch (Menlo Park), Reg Rice (League of Women Voters), Rose Jacobs Gibson (San Mateo County Board of Supervisors), Nicholas Jellins (Menlo Park Council, City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County), Bijan Sartipi (Caltrans), John McLemore (Metropolitan Transportation Commissioner, Caltrain Joint Powers Board Chair, Valley Transportation Authority Board), Richard Napier (C/CAG Executive Director), Walter Martone (C/CAG Staff).

- The purpose of the study will be to identify short, medium and long-range options for addressing congestion problems relating to the approaches to the Dumbarton Bridge and Highway 101 between Routes 84 and 85.
- The 2020 Peninsula Study is one of the recommendations that came out of the Bay Crossing Study done by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).
- There will be many political and environmental hurdles to coming up with acceptable solutions to the congestion on the approaches to the Dumbarton Bridge. Hopefully this study will be able to identify sufficient options that have the potential for gaining wide support. The study will need to result in information and data that will enable the dialogue on these potential solutions to be productive. A major part of the process for developing solutions will be consensus building.
- Most of the individuals that were concerned about a new approach to the Dumbarton Bridge were objecting to a specific solution and not objecting to all solutions.
- At the time that the existing approaches to the Bridge were being developed, the magnitude of the traffic that would be using the Bridge was not recognized. The seriousness of the congestion that has developed was not anticipated. This study is a very responsible way of approaching this problem.
- Two committees have been created to oversee and provide guidance on the study. The Technical Advisory Committee will be responsible for analyzing information, providing a mechanism for giving staff input to the consultant, reviewing the work of the consultant and determining the reasonableness of the work done by the consultant, and providing local transportation expertise to the study. The Policy Advisory Committee will provide guidance on the broad shape and direction of the study. The final outcome of the study will depend on political decisions. The Policy Committee will oversee that process and determine what policies and options will work in the real world. Staff will carefully coordinate the work of

both committees. Information from the Technical Committee will be provided to the Policy Committee on a regular basis for review and consideration. It is anticipated that both committees will offer different perspectives to the process.

- As part of the study consideration will have to be given to the other studies and plans that have been previously been done. Staff should develop a matrix of all other studies that we are aware of and identify how they may impact the study area for the 2020 Peninsula Study.
- One of the things that the Policy Committee needs to do is develop a plan for addressing the political process and building consensus.
- Caltrans reported that they do not have any specific projects in the works that would address the problems that are being considered in this study.
- It will be important to gather specific information on the impacts of the congestion on the local areas impacted. Data collection from these local areas should be done where feasible. Some of the information that should be collected include –
 - The impact of the current situation.
 - Why the situation is unacceptable.
 - What are the hours of delay?
 - What is the impact on the Level of Service?
- The Policy Committee discussed how to conduct the public outreach component of the study.
 - Workshops for stakeholders should be conducted early on in the process and be continuous.
 - Business and neighborhood groups should be included in the outreach.
 - There should be a preliminary draft report to distribute and use as a means to organize the workshop. The purpose should be to get input and respond to questions.
 - A follow up workshop should be held after a more formalized report is available.
 - We need to get a good cross section of individuals for the workshops to ensure that the discussion is not all one sided.
 - Consideration should be given to both day and night meetings to attract different segments of the population.
 - The location of the meetings will be key. The more meetings and the more locations the better the coverage and opportunity for input.
 - Public meetings that are held early in the process would be very useful to get validation on the problem that we are trying to address through the study.
 - It is important that the study and the potential solutions have a regional perspective.
 - At the public meetings we should be prepared to show specific things that have been completed in the study to date and then request comments. We should also be asking for additional ideas for options to explore and ideas on the criteria that should be used to evaluate the possible solutions.
 - References to a “preferred alternative” should not be used early on in the study. It could alarm the public and make individuals think that decisions have already been made. Instead we should be asking for suggestions and input from the community on what criteria should be used to select options for further study. Hopefully this will feed into the consensus building process.
 - This study should be the result of a very thorough process that considers the full range of options. It should not result in the need to go back and conduct additional studies of options that were left off the table.
- The Goals in the Cooperative Agreement need to be restated. Items c and d in the goal section could be reworded to become the goals and items a and b could be reworded to be the objectives. An item should also be added to state that the solutions must meet certain criteria.
- The study outcomes and milestones need to be communicated to city councils and other key

agencies and stakeholders on a regular basis in order to keep these organizations involved in the study.

- The Valley Transportation Authority uses staff to present information directly to its member councils. They use consultants to provide only factual information and data. Staff makes all of the recommendations. This model may be useful for this study.
- The appropriate body to receive information about the study for the Valley Transportation Authority is their Policy Advisory Committee.
- The 2020 Study Technical Advisory Committee could be used to take information to the cities and the city representative on the Policy Advisory Committee can provide additional information addressing the political and policy issues related to the study. Consideration should be given to rotating the Technical and Policy Committee meetings to different communities so others can attend and observe the meetings.
- It was finally decided that the meetings will continue to be held in Menlo Park until the study progresses to the point where there is some materials/outcomes to share with the public and other stakeholders. At that point consideration will be given to moving the location of the meetings.
- There needs to be an emphasis on the regional nature of this study and outreach to individuals/organizations beyond our own constituents.
- The study is anticipated to take from 12 to 18 months to complete.
- After the Scope of Work is developed for the study there should be a public hearing to get input.
- Some of the solutions identified through the study will likely require state and federal funds to implement. We should invite our state and federal legislators to participate in the study process.
- The San Francisco Bay Wildlife Refuge should be added to the outreach list. Larry Hassett will provide a contact person to add to our outreach list.
- Quarterly meetings (or at times when there are project milestones reached) should be scheduled with the other stakeholders.
- The Air Quality District is reviewing impacts on the Baylands. They should be included in our outreach and asked for assistance in reaching other groups/individuals. Duane Bay volunteered to identify a contact person.
- The consultant selected to do the study should conduct focus groups to get ideas/data/input from the various stakeholders. This should be done early on in the process.
- The entire study should eventually feed into the development of a Project Study Report for a specific project that can be programmed through the Regional Transportation Plan and Caltrans.
- Consideration should be given to projects that can be implemented in phases. This will be especially important for very large projects where full funding may have to be secured from different sources and at different times.
- The Committee decided to hold future meetings on the first Wednesday of each month at 4:00 p.m. beginning in May. The April meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 9th at 4:00 p.m.

The meeting concluded at 5:35 p.m.

NOTE: COPIES OF HANDOUTS FROM MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST BY CONTACTING WALTER MARTONE AT 650 599-1465.